DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 543 EC 210 312

AUTHOR Bernacchio, Charles; Fortinsky, Richard
TITLE Improving the Post-Secondary Education and Employability of Learning Disabled Students.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (66th, Washington, DC, March 28-April 1, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demonstration Programs; Educational Planning; *Education Work Relationship; *Employment Potential; High Schools; Individualized Programs; Interdisciplinary Approach; Intervention; *Learning Disabilities; Needs Assessment; *Postsecondary Education; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Special Education; Teamwork; *Transitional Programs; *Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation

ABSTRACT

Using a collaborative approach in three York County (Maine) school districts, representatives from special education and vocational rehabilitation implemented a model program of transition services for specific learning-disabled (SLD) individuals, aged 16 to 22 years old. The experimental group consisted of 32 SLD individuals and the control group consisted of 32 SLD individuals from two non-demonstration school districts. The project's intervention involved a comprehensive SLD assessment, interdisciplinary team planning, individualized service plans, program preparation, and curriculum modifications. At team meetings, assessment results were reported, transition needs were identified, and an individual transition plan was developed for each subject, outlining recommended services and a timeframe. In-service training and technical assistance were provided to community agencies, postsecondary institutions, and school sites to instruct staff to accommodate the learning-disabled subjects in their programs. An evaluation component of the program determined that: (1) project participants who carried out their transition plans more often reported benefits from the project in the areas of job search, job satisfaction, college admission, increased self-confidence, etc., and (2) parents viewed the project as helpful to their children and indicated that the project enhanced their awareness of the availability of funds, services, and transition programs for learning-disabled students. At the time of the follow-up survey, the participants had a higher full-time employment rate and lower part-time employment rate than the control subjects. (JDD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED296543

# Improving the Post-Secondary Education and Employability of Learning Disabled Students

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Charles Bernacchio, M.Ed.

Richard Fortinsky, Ph.D.

This study is the result of a three year federally funded project to provide model transitional services to learning disabled young adults in three southern Maine communities. Because this is a Research and Demonstration project, I will report on some of our findings and the process of implementing this model program. Previous research on the specific learning disabled (SLD) population has indicated they are often unemployed or underemployed, dissatisfied with their school and work experiences and have no plans to obtain employment training. Using a collaborative approach in three school districts, representatives from special education and vocational rehabilitation (VR) in southwestern Maine implemented a model program of services to link educational programs with community resources in planning for transition of the SLD participants.

The following report will examine our experience implementing this research demonstration as we discuss the population of this study; the model's approach; the evaluation design and objectives; our methodology; and results. We will describe our efforts to meet each of the following project objectives:

1. Improve the assessment instrumentation being used to identify and evaluate SLD students.
2. Document skill training needs for SLD students to succeed in employment or higher education.
3. Identify resources to provide skill training in these areas.
4. Implement an interdisciplinary strategy for coordinating transition services for SLD students.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Charles Bernacchio
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 210 312

5. Pilot a tracking system to provide data for program evaluation purposes.

## I. POPULATION

The project served SLD young adults ranging from age 16 to 22 years old. The study group included graduates of no more than 3 years, seniors, juniors, and sophomores in high school. The experimental group consisted of 32 SLD individuals from the sites of Biddeford, Sanford and Kennebunk. Referrals were provided by the cooperating school systems and adult service programs in the community. Criteria for determining SLD status was based on the determination of a learning disability by special education for the York County School Systems which was consistent with the vocational rehabilitation (VR) definition of SLD in Maine.

The control group was selected from 2 non-demonstration school districts. Control subjects numbered 32 and the same criteria was applied in their selection as was used in selecting participants from experimental sites. Referrals were primarily made from the two school systems of South Portland and Windham.

The project's intervention involved the comprehensive SLD assessment, inter-disciplinary team planning, the individualized service plan, program preparation and curriculum modifications.

## II. MODEL

The approach used in this model involved a three pronged strategy:

1. Performing a comprehensive SLD assessment
2. Utilizing assessment results in service plans at the secondary and post-secondary levels
3. Assisting in preparation and placement of SLD in educational and employment training programs.

The model required infusing a process that extended the existing system of services for SLD at the secondary level to include community based programs

and resources being underutilized by this population. The pupil evaluation team in special education evolved into an interdisciplinary transition team to develop an individual plan of services for each participant from the experimental group.

The comprehensive SLD assessment included 3 components performed by various specialists. First, the initial learning disabilities assessment summary instrument was completed by documenting existing test results on file in the high school special education records. This was performed by the Resource Coordinator or special education teacher and alerted the team to needs for more current testing on students. Next, each experimental subject had a Functional Assessment Profile (FAP) performed by the Resource Coordinator. This identified critical areas of functioning relative to school, home and work performance. The FAP determined a subject's abilities in ten life adjustment competency areas. Finally, a vocational evaluation was completed for each and was administered by a licensed vocational evaluator. The Comprehensive Occupational Assessment and Training System (COATS) served to assist in identifying realistic occupational choices and appropriate vocational transition goals for each subject.

The project discovered that most of the documentation at the secondary sites was current and could establish the diagnosis of a learning disability. Whenever gaps existed, new assessments were either performed by special education staff or purchased by VR staff at the experimental sites.

The vocational evaluations were purchased by either secondary school sites or the project (in special cases). Of particular interest was the fact that COATS results appeared to accurately recommend SLD participants for vocational education services. These findings were consistently utilized by the interdisciplinary team in planning services and often benefitted students in accessing the appropriate vocational training.

Unfortunately, this was not the case with the project's use of the Functional Assessment Profile (FAP). Despite having practical implications, many team members were at a loss when recommendations were made from the FAP. It seemed as though for these schools pre-vocational skill training was offered within special education programs primarily to the educable or trainable mentally retarded students and not to the SLD population. Otherwise, a student could receive some splinter skills in the pre-vocational area, i.e. job seeking skills from programs like cooperative education.

However, the FAP findings revealed that many SLD subjects had significant skill deficits in several pre-vocational areas of competency, that required intensive skill training coupled with home support, before these subjects could be expected to function independently on a job (Table A). Since there was such a critical need for programming in this area, the project made pre-vocational skill training the target for curriculum modifications and development to assist SLD participants.

The individual findings from all these instruments were then presented at the interdisciplinary transition team (ITT) meetings to develop an individual service plan for each subject. The team could be comprised of special education staff, vocational trainers, guidance counselors, vocational rehabilitation professionals, adult service providers and representatives from post-secondary institutions. Assessment results were reported and discussed to identify transition needs, program goals and a plan of services. This team served to facilitate the transition process and in effect the project's intervention. The individual transition plan (ITP) was developed and utilized to outline the particular services recommended by the ITT and the timeframe for delivering these services. The participants were tracked into one of three divisions [PREVOCATIONAL, EMPLOYMENT, and HIGHER EDUCATION] based on

their program goals. Each plan identified a case manager from the ITT who was either from a high school or community based program.

The project assisted professionals involved in program service areas. In-service training was provided to community agencies, post-secondary institutions, and school sites to instruct staff to accomodate the learning disabled subjects in their programs. This series of workshops was designed to bring in specialists from the learning disabilities field to prepare teachers, trainers, counselors, administrators, and parents for the transition of these SLD young adults into the community and employment. This effort also involved the collaboration among special education staff and community employment training providers to revise and modify secondary level curriculum for this SLD population based on priorities identified from group assessment findings. Project staff provided technical assistance to the schools, cooperating agencies, employers and post-secondary institutions to adequately train/instruct SLD participants. Implications from test findings as previously noted, identified the greatest area of need to be prevocational. School sites are beginning to develop curriculum to teach prevocational competencies in skill areas, ie. problem solving/decisionmaking, interpersonal/social interaction, self-care/safety, time management, communication, transportation and self-direction, at the secondary level.

Here are some guidelines developed by this project for creating prevocational curriculum at the secondary level. Following these guidelines in Table A are the transition group profile ratings based on the group results from the FAP.

## COMPONENTS OF PREVOCATIONAL CURRICULUM

1. Assessment of Needs (strengths and weaknesses)
   - o Curriculum Based

2. Functional Academic Skills

   Reading - e.g. want ads, directions
   Writing - e.g. job applications, resumes
   Math - e.g. use of money, banking, budget, shopping
   Language - e.g. interview process
   Remedial Help

3. World of Work:

   - o Career Decisionmaking
   - o Job Shadowing/Job Sites
   - o Job Getting/Application, Interview & Followup
   - o Job Keeping/Interaction, Time Management, Responsibility, Money-budgeting, and Transportation Skills
   - o Communication/Verbal & Written & Gestural
   - o Life Work Management/Independent Living & Leisure Time

4. Work Behaviors

   A. Work schedules
   B. Need to listen to supervisor
   C. Need to interact with co-workers
   D. Call in when sick
   E. Assertiveness skills when appropriate
   F. Ability to ask for assistance when appropriate

Table A
GROUP PROFILE RATINGS

| Functional Area | Asset | | Competent | | Major Deficit | | Minor Deficit | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Problem Solving | 1 | 4 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 35 | 10 | 43 |
| Interpersonal Relationships | 3 | 13 | 7 | 30 | 9 | 39 | 4 | 17 |
| Communication | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 39 | 14 | 61 |
| Self-Care | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 78 | 2 | 9 |
| Object Manipulation | 7 | 30 | 14 | 61 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 |
| Mobility | 1 | 4 | 11 | 48 | 7 | 30 | 4 | 17 |
| Time Management | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 61 | 7 | 30 |
| Energy Reserves | 4 | 17 | 12 | 52 | 7 | 30 | 0 | 0 |
| Self-Direction | 5 | 22 | 7 | 30 | 9 | 39 | 2 | 9 |
| Work | 5 | 22 | 5 | 22 | 9 | 39 | 4 | 17 |

The SLD subjects were also given preparation in the form of individual/group counseling and peer support to prepare them for project program placements. The high school and vocational center guidance staff, collaborated with the Resource Coordinator to provide one to one career counseling and guidance using evaluation results. At some sites subjects were clustered into groups and met regularly over the school year. Some of these groups were led by school or vocational counselors to discuss school or home related issues and preparing for an appropriate career. Further support was given through peer group meetings which centered around social activities and a monthly group discussion of personal and employment related concerns, which was directed by the Resource Coordinator.

Vocational rehabilitation counseling was provided to subjects on a case by case basis once they became eligible for VR services. In many of these instances the subjects were referred for more intensive counseling directly from the guidance office or by the Resource Coordinator.

## III. EVALUATION DESIGN

The tracking system used to measure project outcomes was comprised of: 1) The Initial Learning Disabilities Assessment Summary, 2) The Follow-up Questionnaires and 3) Informational Interviews. The Initial Learning Disabilities Assessment Summary was performed on all subjects. It was utilized to collect baseline data on each subject, ie. demographic information, deficit areas, test results, disability type, medical condition, physical limitations, social-emotional status, work history and educational services. This survey also served as part of the comprehensive SLD assessment for the experimental group which was previously discussed.

The second phase of the tracking system was the follow-up questionnaires administered to all subjects. It was designed to generate data to make

comparisons between groups and to measure the extent of the project intervention's impact on the experimental subjects. It was mailed and followed with a phone call which is a strategy that we believe was effective in obtaining responses.

This component addresses major summative evaluation questions, ie. What impact did the project have on educational and employment opportunities for SLD subjects? It provides such information as: referrals for services, services received (past and current), education (current and completed), job search behavior, employment experience, job satisfaction, extent of participation in the process and living arrangements.

The final feature of the tracking system was comprised of a series of informational interviews and two survey questionnaires which were sent to representatives of the major systems in the project and to parents. All the instruments were designed to supplement the evaluation process with qualitative data which would provide more subjective information on how the project did or did not work in these sites. Unfortunately, the professional survey questionnaire had a low response rate. This was unexpected especially since these professionals had readily participated in project activities at their sites. Conversely, we expected a low number of returns from parents but to our surprise the response rate for parents reached 75%. This was truly encouraging since 90% of this group of parents participated in the model's transition planning process.

This information is expected to assist us in addressing the formative evaluation questions, ie. Are the intervention techniques available and working as planned? Are any changes needed to make the model work more effectively? A detailed discussion of some of our findings follows.

EVALUATION:

We developed three evaluation components to assess the impact of the York County Transition Project (YCTP). First, we designed a participant evaluation component to provide a comparison of outcomes between subjects receiving the intervention and those who did not. Next, we conducted a survey of community professionals involved in the YCTP. This group of professionals was comprised of teachers, vocational instructors, school administrators, counselors, job trainers, community program administrators, and post-secondary education personnel. The professionals questionnaire tapped the level of knowledge and involvement by these professionals who worked with the SLD young adults in the YCTP and therefore, serves as a process evaluation tool. Finally, we conducted a survey of parents of YCTP experimental subjects to find out their impressions of the project's benefits to their children. The parent component serves as an outcome evaluation tool in that it measures impact of the project on SLD students. Since there was no comparison group of parents it is difficult to determine accurately the value added by the intervention compared to existing programs for students with SLD.

This presentation will look at the participant and parent components of our evaluation by examining the evaluation objectives, methodology and results of this three year project.

IV. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

A. The major evaluation objectives addressed by the participant component were:

(1) to determine if the YCTP had a positive impact on employment and/or educational opportunities for students with SLD.

(2) to determine if the YCTP resulted in greater access to and utilization of community-based training programs and services.

(3) to determine whether employment and service utilization was related to level of participation in the YCTP.

B. The major objectives of the parent component were:

(1) to determine if YCTP had a positive impact on the employment and/or education of their SLD children.

(2) to determine the extent of the YCTP to influence their SLD children's decision making, planning, and securing employment.

(3) to determine if the YCTP resulted in parents increased knowledge of available services and necessary skills for their children's successful transition from school to the community.

(4) to determine whether the YCTP had a positive impact on parent involvement in their children's transition.

## V. METHOD

Background data on SLD subjects were collected by abstracting information from students' records maintained by the five school districts. This data was recorded on the Initial Learning Disabilities Assessment Summary for all students as previously explained. This provided recorded information about students expressed by teachers or other professionals throughout their education.

Followup data for SLD subjects were obtained via telephone interviews conducted in the spring of 1987. The period of time between students' involvement in the YCTP and the telephone interview ranged from 6 to 18 months, with a mean of 12 months. In order to maximize the response rate for our telephone survey, we mailed a copy of the interview to all participants approximately two weeks before calling. We specified the date and time we would call, and asked students to review the survey ahead of time. Data on the followup interview included employment status, community services used in the past year to prepare for a job or continue education, level of satisfaction with current job, and plans for the future. Students in the transition group were asked an additional series of questions about their

level of involvement with the YCTP, and the impact of the YCTP on various aspects of their lives.

Copies of all our data abstracting forms and telephone survey instrument are available upon request.

A similar procedure to the one used with SLD subjects was employed in obtaining data from parents in the YCTP. The intent of the parent survey was to obtain the parents' perceptions of the project's impact on their children. A survey questionnaire was mailed to each household July 1, 1987, accompanied by a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey and identifying a designated date and time (generally in the evening) that project staff would be telephoning to conduct the survey interview. Parents were instructed to review the survey ahead of time. Telephone interviews were then initiated a week after the mailing, and were conducted with one parent from each household.

## VI. RESULTS

### A. Participants Survey:

Of the 64 participants, a total of 52 completed the telephone survey, for an overall response rate of 81%. We were more successful with the transition group, completing 29 of the 32 attempted interviews (91%).

Our findings from the SLD subjects surveyed are summarized in Tables 1 - 5. The summary of these results will first provide an overview of key background characteristics of students in each group, and then present group comparisons regarding key outcome variables. Finally, it will focus on the transition group to suggest whether level of participation was related to key outcomes.

Due to the small number of subjects in this study, it becomes difficult to draw statistically significant conclusions. However, the findings raise some important questions around transition for this particular population and,

to a degree, reveals the extent of this project's influence on increasing secondary and post-secondary opportunities for those receiving the intervention.

As we examined the study group we learned that nearly three-fourths of those referred were male which may be representative of the SLD school-age population. Yet since the project was voluntary, this could represent a lack of female referrals made by professionals, parents and/or themselves. It could also be suggestive of the need for more outreach to SLD females who may benefit from transition planning, but were not reached by this project for some reason. Clearly, outreach has been a major concern for this project since our recruiting efforts fell far short of the projected 90+ subjects we expected to have.

Examining groups by grade, control subjects in the Freshman and Sophomore years outnumbered transition subjects 2-1. Since 65% of the Transition group consisted of Seniors and Graduates, the potential for full time employment at the time of the follow-up was greatly enhanced for them.

A review of SLD characteristics by study group revealed that significant differences existed between transition and control subjects for those having dyslexia, discalculia and dysgraphia. A comparison of SLD characteristics with academic performance levels of SLD subjects suggests that although the transition group could be considered more severely handicapped by definition of these characteristics they were sometimes performing equal to or better than their counterparts in the corresponding academic subject areas. These differences could also indicate inadequate data collection as a result of inconsistent school reporting since the baseline data gathered on these subjects was taken from available special education documentation sources. We understand this to be true of many school districts in Maine that evaluations

describing the same learning disability may use inconsistent reporting measures. Within some of Maine's school districts there is a lack of uniformity on assessments used to identify the same type of learning disability.

When we looked at academic performance in these subjects it became apparent that for Reading and Math a third of all subjects were functioning at least three years or more below grade level. Their achievement in Spelling indicated that close to half of all subjects in the study functioned below the sixth grade. No marked differences in group performance existed.

At the time of follow-up we discovered that employment status was relatively the same for both groups. For the transition group full-time employment was higher and part-time employment slightly lower (Table 1). This seemed consistent with the fact that many of the control subjects were still attending high school at the time of follow-up and therefore were more likely to be working part-time than in full-time jobs. When we considered job satisfaction, however, the transition subjects ranked particularly higher than the control group with 84% feeling satisfied or very satisfied with their current employment situation whereas, 68% of the control subjects felt this way. We suspect that our use of employment goals to direct transition planning was a contributing factor in this case. We believe the transition subjects were better informed about their occupational choices and received vocational counseling which may have resulted in their having more realistic expectations about work.

Our study suggests that there was a substantial difference in service or program utilization in four service areas which can be attributed to some degree to the project. Transition group members stated that they were more often accessing tutoring services, cooperative education courses and adult

education than those in the control group (Table 2). It was also apparent that the experimental subjects were using vocational rehabilitation services with some frequency while control subjects were not. For both groups of SLD subjects school-based programs and services were more predominantly utilized than the community-based programs linked to the project. We feel this is an area that continues to need to be developed. With the exception of on-the-job training (OJT) our community-based services were only used by 4 to 14% of the SLD population in this study.

Finally, we have considered the effect that the level of participation of transition subjects may have had on employment, wages, job satisfaction, use of community services, and other benefits (Tables 4 and 5). Although those transition subjects not using their plans had a higher rate of full-time employment, we learned that the users had a greater number in part-time employment. Another interesting finding was that users were all employed, however, non-users had an unemployment rate of 16.7% and the control group had a 14.3% unemployment rate. We also discovered that users were on the average paid a higher hourly wage than both non-users and control subjects. Furthermore, it was evident that SLD subjects using their transition plan were nearly three times more likely to use community services for employment or education than those not using their plans and nearly twice as likely to do so than the control subjects.

Our results generally indicated that among project participants those who used their plans more often reported benefits from the project's assistance that helped them: know and utilize community programs/services; find, apply for, secure and maintain a job; be satisfied with a job; be admitted to college; gain self-confidence; and know where to get help.

B. Parents Survey:

As noted previously, 32 SLD youths participated in this project. Telephone interviews were conducted with 24 of the youths' parents, a response rate of 75.0 percent. Major areas addressed through the interviews were questions concerning: school, employment, skills enhanced, services provided, continuing need for services, and the project's influence on youth. In addition, parents' involvement in project-related activities was also examined. For the reader interested in examining the interview results in greater detail than presented in the narrative, Tables 6-12 will provide more data.

At the time of the telephone survey, 66.7% of the parents interviewed indicated that their son/daughter was no longer in high school. Eighty-three percent reported that their children were employed, with one-half being employed full-time and one-third employed part-time. The remaining 16.7% reported that their children had full-time summer (seasonal) employment.

Almost sixty percent of the parents (58.3%) reported that their children had been employed seven months or more. Sixty-two percent were reportedly employed in service-oriented jobs, and 62.5 % were earning $3.50 to $5.50 per hour. Sixty-one percent of the parents (n=14) indicated that their children had also held other jobs during the year prior to the survey.

Parents were asked to identify which skills and/or services helped (or could have helped) their son/daughter in getting a job, planning and decision making. On-the-job training was cited most frequently as having helped their son/daughter get the current job (43.5%), while vocational rehabilitation was not cited by any of the parents. Provision of vocational training was cited most frequently (26.1%) by parents as having the greatest potential for enhancing their child's chance of getting a job.

The services provided by the project's resource coordinator were cited most often as having influenced their son/daughter's planning his/her schedule (30.4%), while transition pupil evaluation team meetings were cited with least frequency (4.3%) The largest percentage of parents (34.8%) perceived that they influenced their child's decisions more than any school, community or project affiliated personnel.

In rating the importance of various knowledge and/or skills in facilitating transition from school to the community, parents viewed good work habits, i.e. getting along with others, dependability, etc., as being most important, while vocational and technical knowledge and skills were viewed as being least important.

Seven parents (30.4%) indicated that their son/daughter could have used additional services in making the transition from school to work. Two respondents indicated that earlier vocational training would have been helpful, and two cited real world training (on-the-job training), and one mentioned continuing education beyond high school.

A large percentage of parents indicated that they discussed their child's options before the transition project team meeting (78.3%), citing school personnel as being consulted most frequently (78.3%). More specifically, parents reported that options were discussed most frequently with guidance counselors (52.2%) and special education teachers (43.5%). Consultations with vocational rehabilitation representatives were mentioned with least frequency (4.3%).

Three in four parents indicated that they felt they had been involved in planning and decision-making concerning their child's transition plan. Participation was defined by 88.2% of the parents as attending team meetings, and 88.2% also cited asking questions. Participation by offering suggestions

The services provided by the project's resource coordinator were cited most often as having influenced their son/daughter's planning his/her schedule (30.4%), while transition pupil evaluation team meetings were cited with least frequency (4.3%) The largest percentage of parents (34.8%) perceived that they influenced their child's decisions more than any school, community or project affiliated personnel.

In rating the importance of various knowledge and/or skills in facilitating transition from school to the community, parents viewed good work habits, i.e. getting along with others, dependability, etc., as being most important, while vocational and technical knowledge and skills were viewed as being least important.

Seven parents (30.4%) indicated that their son/daughter could have used additional services in making the transition from school to work. Two respondents indicated that earlier vocational training would have been helpful, and two cited real world training (on-the-job training), and one mentioned continuing education beyond high school.

A large percentage of parents indicated that they discussed their child's options before the transition project team meeting (78.3%), citing school personnel as being consulted most frequently (78.3%). More specifically, parents reported that options were discussed most frequently with guidance counselors (52.2%) and special education teachers (43.5%). Consultations with vocational rehabilitation representatives were mentioned with least frequency (4.3%).

Three in four parents indicated that they felt they had been involved in planning and decision-making concerning their child's transition plan. Participation was defined by 88.2% of the parents as attending team meetings, and 88.2% also cited asking questions. Participation by offering suggestions and/or information as related to the transition plan was cited by only nine parents (52.9%).

and/or information as related to the transition plan was cited by only nine parents (52.9%).

Generally, parents viewed the project as being worthwhile and helpful to their children. Parents also indicated that the project enhanced their awareness of the availability of funds, services and/or programs for learning disabled students to assist them from school to work (63.6%).

Summary

A review of SLD participant characteristics suggests that most were maile seniors and graduates in the York County Transition Project. The transition subjects had a higher incidence of dyslexia, discalculia and dysgraphia. The SLD participants in both groups were performing equally in major academic subject areas. Their reading and mathematics scores indicated they were functioning three or more years below grade level and spelling achievement was below the sixth grade level for all SLD subjects.

At the time of follow-up, the transition group had a higher full time employment rate and lower part-time employment rate than the control subjects. The transition group's unemployment rate was reported at 7.4% which was inconsistent with the parents surveyed who gave an unemployment rate of 16.7% for these SLD students. Parents also revealed that for 62% of the SLD employed full time, earnings ranged from $3.50 to $5.50 per hour. Sixty percent of the parents stated that their SLD children had been employed in their current job for seven or more months and a high percentage of the employed transition participants (84%) expressed feelings of satisfaction with their current employment situation.

Results from our study revealed that transition subjects were more frequently accessing a wide range of school and community based services than non-transition subjects. Of the services used, school-based programs were

more often utilized by SLD subjects. Consistent reporting between transition subjects and their parents also suggested that vocational rehabilitation was underutilized in this project.

Findings from the parent survey indicated that parents viewed themselves as having had the greatest influence in their child's decisions pertaining to school and work. Furthermore, the transition subjects choosing to use their individual plans demonstrated a lower unemployment, higher hourly wage and greater utilization of community resources than non-users and control subjects.

Finally, parents of the transition SLD group perceived good work habits to be most important for transition from school to the community. They cited that they had discussed their child's options before the transition project meeting occurred and that three in four parents felt they had been involved in the planning and decision-making concerning their child's transition plan.

**York County Transition Project**
**Participant Survey**

Table 1
Employment Status at Followup by Study Group

| Employment Status | Transition Group | | Control Group | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Full-time | 18 | 66.7 | 11 | 52.4 | 29 | 60.4 |
| Part-time | 7 | 25.9 | 7 | 33.3 | 14 | 29.2 |
| Not employed/ not looking | 2 | 7.4 | 3 | 14.3 | 5 | 10.4 |
| TOTAL* | 27 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 | 48 | 100.0 |

*Based on 48 out of 52 respondents to telephone survey. The remainder had missing data on this item.

Table 2
Utilization of Community Services or Programs by Study Group

| Service or Program* | Transition Group | | Control Group | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Job training program | 3 | 10.3 | 2 | 8.7 | 5 | 9.6 |
| Vocational Rehab. | 2 | 6.9 | 0 | - | 2 | 3.9 |
| Special Education | 9 | 31.0 | 6 | 26.1 | 15 | 28.9 |
| On-job training | 12 | 41.4 | 8 | 34.8 | 20 | 38.5 |
| Vocational training | 10 | 34.5 | 9 | 39.1 | 19 | 36.5 |
| Adult Education | 6 | 20.7 | 1 | 4.4 | 7 | 13.5 |
| Counseling | 6 | 20.7 | 5 | 21.7 | 11 | 21.2 |
| Co-op | 6 | 20.7 | 1 | 4.4 | 7 | 13.5 |
| Tutoring | 8 | 27.6 | 4 | 17.4 | 12 | 23.1 |

*Figures show number and percent who reported using each service in the past year during the telephone survey.

Table 3
Future Plans by Study Group

| Specific Plan* | Transition Group | | Control Group | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| College | 9 | 31.0 | 9 | 39.1 | 18 | 34.6 |
| Military Service | 3 | 10.3 | 2 | 8.7 | 5 | 9.6 |
| Voc-tech school | 7 | 24.1 | 5 | 21.7 | 12 | 23.1 |
| Full-time work | 20 | 68.9 | 14 | 60.9 | 34 | 65.3 |
| Part-time work and school | 10 | 34.5 | 11 | 47.8 | 21 | 40.4 |
| Part-time work only | 2 | 6.9 | 1 | 4.4 | 3 | 5.8 |
| Don't know | 5 | 17.2 | 3 | 13.0 | 8 | 15.3 |

*Figures show number and percent who reported each specific plan during the telephone survey.

Table 4
Employment Status by Level of Participation in YCTP

| Employment Status | Level of Participation: Used Transition Plan | | Did Not Use Transition Plan | | Control Group | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Full-time | 9 | 60.0 | 9 | 75.0 | 11 | 52.4 |
| Part-time | 6 | 40.0 | 1 | 8.3 | 7 | 33.3 |
| Not employed/ not looking | 0 | - | 2 | 16.7 | 3 | 14.3 |
| Totals* | 15 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 21 | 100.0 |

*Total sample sizes for these three groups are:
Used transition plan: 16
Did not use transition plan: 13
Control group: 23

Table 5
Positive Impact of YCTP in Specific Areas, by Level of Participation

| Area Helped by YCTP* | Used Transition Plan | | Did Not Use Transition Plan | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Knowing about programs and services outside school | 9 | 60.0 | 7 | 53.9 |
| Getting help from community programs and services | 7 | 46.7 | 4 | 30.8 |
| Finding and applying for work | 7 | 46.7 | 1 | 7.7 |
| Getting a job | 7 | 46.7 | 2 | 15.4 |
| Keeping your job | 7 | 46.7 | 2 | 15.4 |
| Being satisfied with your job | 8 | 53.3 | 6 | 46.2 |
| Getting into college | 5 | 33.3 | 3 | 23.1 |
| Gaining self-confidence | 13 | 86.7 | 8 | 61.5 |
| Knowing where to get help | 11 | 73.3 | 8 | 61.5 |

*Figures show number and percent who reported that the YCTP helped them in each area specified (other choices: no effect, or hurt you).

Table 6
Employment Status of Transition Subjects

| Employment | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Presently employed full-time (30 hrs.+) | 12 | 50.0 |
| Part-time (29 hrs. or less) | 8 | 33.3 |
| Unemployed and looking for work | 0 | 0.0 |
| Unemployed and not looking for work | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 4 | 16.7 |
| Total | 24 | 100.0 |

Other Specifications:

| Response | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Summer employment, full-time | 4 | 16.7 |

Table 7
Employment Characteristics of Current Job

| Length of time employed: | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1 to 6 | 10 | 41.6 |
| 7 to 12 | 9 | 37.5 |
| More than 1 year | 5 | 20.8 |
| Total | 24 | 99.9 |

| Job Title: | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Service | 15 | 62.4 |
| Skilled/manual labor | 6 | 25.0 |
| Sales | 1 | 4.2 |
| Professional/technical | 1 | 4.2 |
| Military | 1 | 4.2 |
| Total | 24 | 100.0 |

| Hourly Wage: | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| $3.50-$4.50 | 7 | 43.8 |
| $4.51-$5.50 | 3 | 18.7 |
| $5.51-$6.50 | 4 | 25.0 |
| $6.51-or more | 2 | 12.5 |
| Total | 16 | 100.0 |

Table 8
Extent of Influence on Student Planning

| Influencing Factors | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| o Career counseling by project's resource coordinator | 7 | 30.4 |
| o Guidance counseling | 5 | 21.7 |
| o Vocational evaluation | 4 | 17.4 |
| o Special education classes | 4 | 17.4 |
| o After school peer group sessions | 3 | 13.1 |
| o Vocational instruction | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Functional assessment | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Transition PET meeting | 1 | 4.3 |
| o Other | 5 | 21.7 |
| **Other specifications:** | | |
| o Teachers | 3 | 60.0 |
| o Co-op | 1 | 20.0 |
| o Mother | 1 | 20.0 |
| Total | 5 | 100.0 |

Table 9
Extent of Influence on Student in Decision-Making

| Response | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| o Parents | 8 | 34.8 |
| o Family/friends | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Classroom teacher | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Vocational instructor | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Project's resource coordinator | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Guidance counselor | 1 | 4.3 |
| o Special education teacher | 0 | 0.0 |
| o Vocational rehabilitation counselor | 0 | 0.0 |
| o Principal | 0 | 0.0 |
| o No one | 3 | 13.0 |
| o Other individuals | 3 | 13.0 |
| Total | 23 | 100.0 |
| **Other specifications:** | | |
| o The child (him/herself) | 2 | 66.6 |
| o Missing data | 1 | 33.3 |
| Total | 3 | 100.0 |

Table 10
Importance of Knowledge/Skills For Transition

| Elements | Least 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Most 5 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| o Good work habits, getting along with others, dependability, etc. | - | - | - | 4 (17.4%) | 19 (82.6%) | 23 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.826) | | | | | | |
| o Social skills (positive self-esteem, respect for others) | 1 (4.3%) | - | 2 (8.7%) | 2 (8.7%) | 18 (78.3%) | 23 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.565) | | | | | | |
| o Academic skills (reading, writing, and math) | - | - | 4 (17.4%) | 1 (4.3%) | 18 (78.3%) | 23 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.608) | | | | | | |
| o Communication skills (ability to express yourself to others) | 1 (4.3%) | - | - | 5 (21.7%) | 17 (73.9%) | 23 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.608) | | | | | | |
| o Work experience (actually having had a job) | - | 1 (4.3%) | 2 (8.7%) | 5 (21.7%) | 14 (60.9%) | 22 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.652) | | | | | | |
| o Vocational and technical knowledge and skills | 1 (4.3%) | 1 (4.3%) | 4 (17.4%) | 7 (30.4%) | 10 (43.5%) | 23 (100.0%) |
| (Average = 4.043) | | | | | | |

Table 11
Future Plans of Transition Subjects

| Future Plans | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| o Immediate full-time job | 13 | 56.5 |
| o Live at home | 8 | 34.8 |
| o Live with others | 8 | 34.8 |
| o College/junior college | 6 | 26.1 |
| o Vocational technical school | 5 | 21.7 |
| o Don't know | 4 | 17.4 |
| o Part-time job and school | 4 | 17.4 |
| o Don't Know | 4 | 17.4 |
| o Part-time job only | 2 | 8.7 |
| o Military service | 2 | 8.7 |

Table 12
Extent of Parent Involvement

A. Attended Team Meeting(s)

| Response | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 20 | 90.0 |
| No | 2 | 10.0 |
| Total | 22 | 100.0 |

IF NO, why not?

Not aware of the meeting: 2 parents

B. Degree of participation

| Response | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| o Attended team meeting | 15 | 88.2 |
| o Asked questions | 15 | 88.2 |
| o Expressed concerns | 13 | 76.4 |
| o Asked about evaluation results | 11 | 64.7 |
| o Offered suggestions/information | 9 | 52.9 |

| Number of Times Attended Team Meeting | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| One | 9 | 60.0 |
| Two | 1 | 6.6 |
| Three | 3 | 20.0 |
| Four | 2 | 13.3 |
| TOTAL | 15 | 99.9 |

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the
Council for Exceptional Children
(66th, Washington, DC, March 28-April 1, 1988)